

**Minutes
Newton Planning Commission
October 26, 2004
Council Chambers
City Hall**

The regular meeting of the Newton Planning Commission was held at 7:30 p.m. on October 26, 2004 in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Members

Present: Brevard Arndt
Gary Corne
Kent Elliott
Clinton Sigmon
Stan Winstead

Members

Absent: Stan Gabriel
Ken Simmons

Staff

Present: Glenn Pattishall, AICP Planning Director
Alex Fulbright, AICP Planner

Others: None

Chairman Arndt called the meeting to order.

Item 2: Approval of Minutes September 28, 2004 Meeting

Chairman Arndt asked for consideration of the minutes, if there were any corrections or additions.

Mr. Elliott stated that on Page #4, Paragraph 3, the word some needed to be inserted before people so that the sentence would read "Kent Elliott said that some people buy based on monthly payments." Also in Paragraph #12 on Page #4, **Mr. Elliott** requested that the sentence be rewritten to read as follows "Kent Elliott questioned could we make concessions by allowing density bonuses in exchange for sidewalks on both sides?" On Page #5, **Mr. Pattishall** noted that in Paragraph #3, Sentence #2, the word storm buffer needed to be changed to stream buffer. With no further corrections or additions to the minutes, **Chairman Arndt** ruled that the minutes were approved as amended.

Item 3: Consideration of Eastside Area Specific Plans

Mr. Pattishall stated that at the last meeting the staff was directed by the Planning Commission to prepare alternative wording for stream buffers and also for East A Street extension and to meet with Mr. Reilly concerning East A Street. Mr. Pattishall presented proposed wording changes to the Draft Eastside Area Specific Plan. The new wording for Policy #EV-1 would read as follows: Streams within the planning area should be protected with stream buffers measured from the stream banks at widths which are appropriate given due consideration to topography, stream characteristics and adjacent land uses as shown on Map #7, Hydrology.

Mr. Pattishall stated that Policy #T-5 was requested to be changed and read the following wording: The city should recommend to the MPO that East A Street be extended from its existing end point to the Newton-Conover Loop. This will improve east/west access through the planning area as well as providing access to the Loop from the Central Business District. The ultimate alignment for this thoroughfare should be such that it minimizes the adverse impacts on residents.

Mr. Pattishall then asked Mr. Fulbright to advise the Planning Commission of his discussion with Bud Reilly concerning East A Street extension. **Mr. Fulbright** discussed the contents of his meeting on the East A Street Extension. He explained to Mr. Reilly that there must be two definite points within which the thoroughfare has to fit. The beginning and end points as defined by NCDOT stated that the NCDOT thoroughfare planning engineer, Lynn Nguyen indicated that those points could not change but that depending on topo and curvature, the road within those points could change. Mr. Fulbright said that he had met with Mr. Reilly and looked at some revisions and had sent to NCDOT for approval, was waiting for them to approve the revised alignment. He indicated that Mr. Reilly did not particularly like the fact that the thoroughfare would come through or close to his home but at least conceded that there were some good points to the thoroughfare and was agreeable to the recommended alignment that was sent to NCDOT.

Kent Elliott said that he felt the Planning Commission should also discuss sidewalks. He felt that that issue had not been resolved, based on the minutes. He questioned whether the cities locally required. **Mr. Fulbright** responded that Conover requires sidewalks on both sides and that Hickory requires both in most cases.

Mr. Elliott said the City shouldn't have requirements that are not compatible with other cities and suggested that the City may want to offer density bonuses for sidewalks on both sides.

Mr. Corne said he didn't mind requiring something that was aesthetically pleasing, provided it was similar to what other cities required.

Mr. Winstead asked about the cross sections of streets and the widths.

Mr. Pattishall explained that the widths were determined based on the City's Manual of Specifications and that part of this plan recommendation was to review and revise the design guidelines for various things. He indicated that the sidewalks would be something the City would be preparing some cross sections for to better incorporate planning strips, utilities, and streets and street trees.

Mr. Arndt said he had considered the situation with regard to sidewalks on both sides and felt that the Planning Commission should recommend five foot widths and that sidewalks be required on both sides of new streets.

Mr. Winstead said he felt that sidewalks were about people walking and should be a sufficient width for people to pass each other.

Mr. Pattishall explained the width per A.D.A. requirements. He stated that this should be a standard that the City maintains everywhere and the City should not rely on private property owners to provide for A.D.A. compliance.

Mr. Winstead said he felt that it made good design sense.

With no further discussion, **Chairman Arndt** asked for a motion. Motion was made by **Mr. Corne**, seconded by **Mr. Sigmon**, and unanimously adopted that the proposed wording to Policy #EV-1 Stream Buffers

be revised per staff recommendation and that Policy #25 concerning East A Street extension wording be revised and further that the five foot sidewalk widths be retained in the Plan as well as sidewalks on both sides.

Item 4: Old Business

There was none.

Item 5: New Business – Discussion of Subdivision Regulation Amendment Speed Limits

Mr. Pattishall reviewed a memo to the Planning Commission dated October 18th from Richard Crump concerning speed limits in subdivisions. He stated that there had been some developers wanting to have lower speed limits posted in subdivisions than what was prescribed by the City in terms of the general statutes. He said currently the law is that the speed limit is 35mph unless otherwise posted. **Mr. Pattishall** said that the SRB discussed speed limits and there was a recommendation from the S.R.B. that the subdivision regulations be amended to specifically state what speed limits were within new subdivisions and further to state that the speed limits could only be changed by ordinance if the City Council designated different speed limit.

After general discussion, there was a motion made by **Mr. Corne**, seconded by **Mr. Elliott**, unanimously adopted that the proposed wording be recommended to the City Council for approval as an amendment to the subdivision regulations for speed limits in subdivisions.

Item 6: Reports

Mr. Pattishall reviewed the Permit Report and the Code Enforcement Report for the month of September, 2004.

Item 7: Adjournment

With no further discussion, meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Glenn J. Pattishall/AICP
Secretary

ds